

TATAR LANGUAGE NON-DERIVATIVE VERBS IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Vilyuza Robertovna Gafarova, Gulshat Raisovna Galiullina

Institute of philology and intercultural communication, Kazan Federal University,
Kazan, 18 Kremlyovskaya str. (RUSSIA)

DOI: 10.7813/jll.2015/6-2/25

Received: 06 Jan, 2015

Accepted: 03 Mar, 2015

ABSTRACT

The article deals with structure of modern non-derivative verbs of Tatar language and describes reasons of historically derivative words conversion into non-derivative ones. The authors have highlighted the fact that it is a historical tradition that in Turkic languages only monosyllabic verbs are really root, and disyllabic and trisyllabic verbs are the result of complication of monosyllabic ones. The article involves using of methods of external and internal reconstruction, comparative and relative comparative methods, and also etymological, word-formative and morphemic analysis. In the course of language evolution derived stems components lost their initial meaning and combined into an integral whole. In some cases the first or the second component lost its meaning, and in other cases both ones lost their meanings. Tatar language has lots of affixes which are an integral part of a stem, and nowadays these morphemes do not exist individually. Analysis of Tatar active lexicon has allowed to draw the conclusion that derivative words conversion into non-derivative ones is explained by such changes as de-etymologization and substitution. Despite the fact that de-etymologization is characteristic of inflectional languages, in agglutinative Tatar language de-etymologization affects etymologically composite words. The authors found several reasons of de-etymologization: archaization of a word and complete death of a root; death of an affix, phonetic changes connected with it, and also cases of semantic de-etymologization. Upon analysis the authors found that in the course of substitution morphemic structure of words was preserved. Tatar language distinguishes itself due to some morphogenetic affixes transition into word-formative affixes composition. Owing to etymologic analysis, the authors has drawn the conclusion that monosyllableness of verb roots in Turkic languages is confirmed by Tatar language too. Non-derivative disyllabic and trisyllabic verbs are historically derivative words composed with affixes and independent roots. Nowadays they are considered to be indecomposable lexical units. System analysis of Tatar language indecomposable verbs allowed to reveal historical and modern word structure, and also to demonstrate evolution of individual affixal elements in the language. It has been found that studied phenomena date back to different chronological stages of structural grammatical changes of the language. Full de-etymologization is older. The research results will be useful for relative comparative study of languages, for finding of initial roots of Turkic languages.

Key words: Tatar language, root, stem, monosyllabic verbs, non-derivative verbs, disyllabic and trisyllabic roots, affixes, de-etymologization, substitution

1. INTRODUCTION

The problem of root structure has been always in the centre of Turkology researchers' attention. Historical changes in word structure were analyzed in works of M. Melioranskiy [1], G.I. Ramstedt [2], C. Brockelmann [3], N.A. Baskakov [4], A.N. Kononov [5], A.M. Shcherbak [6], K. Musayev [7], A.T. Kaidarov [8], A.V. Dybo [9] etc. In modern linguistics some aspects of a Turkic root are in the picture of foreign monographs too [10, 11].

As far back as in 1900 P.M. Melioranskiy noted that in Turkic languages roots were originally monosyllabic [1]. G.I. Ramstedt, on the contrary, believed that in Turkic languages most of roots of words (including verbs) were historically disyllabic [2]. Famous German scientists C. Brockelmann took up the position that since olden times Turkic languages have had several types of roots, including monosyllabic, disyllabic and trisyllabic, mostly of disputable origin [3].

Nowadays many Altaists and Turkologists believe in initial roots monosyllableness (N.A. Baskakov [4], A.N. Kononov [5], A.T. Kaidarov [8], E.V., T.M. Garipov [12], F.M. Khisamova [13] etc.).

The history of studying of roots and stems of Tatar language began with works of V.A. Bogoroditskiy [14]. It is represented in different aspects in researches of such authors as K.M. Musayev [7], A.V. Dybo [9], F.M. Khisamova [13], A.G. Shaikhulov [15], R.G. Akhmetianov [16], F.Sh. Nurieva [17], M. Oner [18] etc. Notwithstanding the fact that there are quite a lot of researches on Turkic languages in linguistics, diachronic synchronic approach to study of non-derivative roots and stems of Tatar verbs has not got due attention.

This article is dedicated to study and analysis of structure of modern non-derivative verb roots, and also forms of buildup of a Tatar verb stem in historical perspective. The work's purpose is to single out "obscured" roots in composition of indecomposable verbs, that became the stem for creation of derivative units, and to reveal main reasons of conversion of historically derivative words into non-derivative ones. Verb roots monosyllableness will be hereafter a reference point in our approach to analysis of derivative verbs with some word-formative affixes.

System analysis of Tatar language indecomposable verbs will allow to reveal historical and modern word structure, and to demonstrate evolution of some affixal elements in the language.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Materials for analysis and conclusions illustrations were taken from Tatar language dialect dictionaries [19], Tatar language definition dictionaries [20, 21], Turkic languages etymologic dictionaries [16, 22, 23].

For materials analysis we used: comparative method, method of external and internal reconstruction, relative comparative, and also etymologic, word-formative and morphemic analysis. In the course of research of disyllabic and trisyllabic non-derivative verbs we revealed presumptive historical roots and affixal elements.

3. RESULTS

In modern Tatar language monosyllabic, di- and trisyllabic words are all roots by structure. Tatar language non-derivative disyllabic and trisyllabic verbs are historically derivative, and at the synchronic stage of language evolution they lost meaning of the first or the second component. Prominent Tatar linguist F.M. Khisamova also mentions this: "a word root in Turkic languages is an undividable, minimal, but quite independent part of a word, bearing a lexical meaning, but in historical perspective it can be derivative" [13]. As have been said before, only monosyllabic verbs are historically really root. In the course of language evolution derivative stems components lost initial meaning and combined into an integral whole. In some cases the first or the second component lost its meaning, and in other cases both ones lost their meanings. For example, Tatar language has lots of affixes which are an integral part of a stem, and nowadays there are no such stems without these affixes, and no affixes without these stems. The result of language historical evolution is changes influencing their phono-, morphemic structure, morphological characteristics and lexical meaning, therefore creating new units with already changes structure.

Factual material analysis gives ground for asserting that in Tatar language derivative words conversion into non-derivative ones are explained by such changes as de-etymologization and substitution.

De-etymologization is a lexico-morphological phenomenon lying in obscuring of initial structure of a word due to blurring of morphological distinction between its components, i.e. as a result of transformation of a stem which were dividable before into an undividable root [24]. This phenomenon is most frequently observed in inflectional languages, but in Tatar language (which is an agglutinative language) de-etymologization affects etymologically complex words.

Let us single out main reasons of de-etymologization in Tatar language.

The most distinctive reason is archaization of a word and/or complete death of a root. For example, lexical units (existing in Tatar literary language active vocabulary) *атла*- 'to pace', *сула*- 'to breathe', *сайла*- 'to choose', *сапла*- 'to thread', *тыңла*- 'to listen', *тәпәлә*- 'to beat' are root words, though there is a clear affix *-ла* in them, which is the most productive among verb-formative affixes. *Ат, сул, сай, сап, тың, тәпә* were historically roots, but in modern language they are not used as independent roots and have no lexical meaning without affix *-ла*.

Атла- 'to pace' from noun *ат* 'pace' > а: тлe – атла derivative verb with affix *-ла* from *а**: *м* - *а**: *д* - *ә**: *д* 'pace' or recurring action form from *а**: *м* - *а**: *д* - *ә**: *д* 'to pace', 'to step' [12];

сайла- 'to choose' from secondary root *сай/сайы* 'count' (Crimean, Azerbaijani, Turkish), going back to ancient verb *сә-'to choose', 'to count' [6];

сапла- 'to thread' – derivative verb with affix *-ла* *отсап* 'thread', which is observed in Khalaj and Azerbaijani languages [6];

сула- 'to breathe' - derivative verb with affix *-ла* from ancient root *сыл* 'hard breathing in' (Chagatai) [16];

тәпәлә- 'to beat' from noun *тәпә* 'head', which is preserved in Siberian Tatars dialect, Yakut and Altai languages;

тыңла- 'to listen', 'to obey' from noun **тың* 'listening', 'eavesdropping', 'sound' [6];

алда- 'to fool', 'to deceive'. Ancient root of word **ал* 'cunning', 'deceit', element *-да* plays the role of an affix [6]. In modern Tatar literary language *ал* 'cunning' is not used independently, but in Turkish, Chagatai, Uigur languages it has been preserved with the meaning 'cunning', and element *-да*, having lost here its word-formative capability, transformed into a phonetic formant. In a certain historical period they merged together and formed a simple word;

озай- 'to lengthen' from noun *оз* 'length', 'height' (Khakas) [16];

соклан- 'to wonder' from noun *соқ* 'greedy', 'envious' [22, 23] (Kirghiz, Kazakh, Karakalpak, Kumyk);

сына- 'to test' from noun *сын* 'test' (Kirghiz) [23].

Ancient roots of these verbs are not observed in modern Tatar language independently, from whence these disyllabic words are perceived as simple. However, some roots which are considered to be dead in modern language are popular in Tatar dialects.

For example, in word *сырла*- 'to ornament' we can mark out a root *сыр* 'paint', preserved in Mishar dialect. In modern Tatar language *сыр* is used in the noun meaning 'line'. Words *сызла*- 'to be sick', 'to whimper'; *сыкра*- 'to whimper'; *елыш*- 'to nestle' are also secondary roots, because they are subject to decomposition. Their etymologic roots are preserved in Siberian Tatars dialect: *сыс* 'bone ache', 'body pain'; *сык* 'moan'; *ыыл*- 'to move'.

De-etymologization is also the result of the fact that an affix stops being separate and merges with a root, i.e. affix's death occurs. For instance, word *сүзәр*- 'to give to drink' is formed from noun *сү* 'water'. In this word ancient monosyllabic root *сү* is preserved in modern Tatar literary language in unchanged form, and affix *-әр* is now a dead formant and plays the role of indecomposable complex.

Башкар- 'to execute' from noun *баш* 'head', 'main';

искәр- 'to take note' from noun *ис* 'notion';

коткар- 'to save' from noun *кот* 'happiness' [23];

эшкәр(м)- 'to process' from noun *эш* 'to work';

кабыз- 'to ignite' from verb *кап*- 'to grasp', 'to light' [23].

Affixes' dead forms have ceased to take part in word formation long ago and have merged with root so closely that an inseparable morphologic unity has been formed; it is perceived as some kind of a new root. Their separation from a secondary root composition threatens with breakup of its structure and misunderstanding of its semantics at the modern stage of language evolution [12].

In modern Tatar language among desemantized affixes we can mention formants *-кар/-кәр*, *-ыз/-ез*, *сәм*-. Affixes can lose their meaning also due to such lexico-semantic phenomena as lexicalization, creation of figurative meanings, cases of metaphorical usage of word forms. When a figurative meaning is created, an affix loses its meaning.

In course of words de-etymologization some phonetic phenomena occur; they are systematized on the basis of facts in the following way:

- a) drop out of a sound or sounds:

Word *кыйна*-to punish', 'to beat' is not considered to be a derivative one, because word *кыйын* 'suffering', being a root, with adding affix *-а* lost vowel sound *ы* and transformed into the form *кыйн*, having no independent meaning. Also we can mention here word *ялкым*-to tire' from verb *ялык*- 'to get tired', which goes back to adjective *котрый ял* 'lazy'.

Next examples demonstrate drop out of a sound *л*. Verb *кутер*-to bring' in the full phonetic variant is *култер*- 'to bring' and goes back to verb *кул*- 'to come'. *Тутыр*- 'to fill' in Bashkir and dialects of Tatar language comes out in the form of a verb *тултыр*- 'to fill', which goes back to verb *тул*- 'to fill'; *үмер*- 'to kill' from verb *үл*- 'to die', where *-тыр/-тер* is a word-formative affix.

Урла-to steal', 'to snatch' – a phonetically more complete form of this verb is *угырла*- 'to steal', the stem goes back to noun *угыр* 'thief'.

б) interchange of sounds:

Борчы-to disturb' from noun *боз*- 'to spoil'; in this case we can see interchange of phonemes *р-з*;

адаш-to stray' – a derivative verb with affix *-ашот* of the ancient root **аз*- 'to stray';

сөйлә- 'to speak', 'to tell' from noun **сө:з* 'word'. In this case we can see interchange *з-й*;

юмша- 'to mellow', 'to relax' from noun *юм*'feather', 'crumb'. In modern language noun root is preserved in the form *юн*'feather';

кауша- 'to be embarrassed', 'to be lost' from adjective *как* 'dry'/'to dry oneself';

эндәш-to respond', 'to call' – derivative verb with affix *-шот* of verb *өндә*- 'to invoke', which goes back to ancient root – noun *өн* 'voice'.

Due to phonetical changes the boundaries between initial morphemic members are effaced, and as a result of such phenomena the structure of a word becomes obscure.

We can observe cases of semantic de-etymologization accompanied by revision of word's meaning in general or narrowing of lexical meaning. Meanings of many words stepped considerably aside from meaning of producing initial stem, and they began to be used in figurative meaning. Sometimes the connection between a new formation and its previous stem (and also words with the same root) can be broken. For instance, verb *өйлән*- 'to marry' descended from noun *өй* 'house', literally 'to acquire house', root and stem lost semantic connections, and nowadays verb stem structure is perceived as a non-derivative one. The Siberian Tatars dialect has a verb *өйлә*- 'to be in a house';

билә- 'to possess' - derivative verb with affix *-ләот* of ancient root *бу* 'prince', 'master';

тәпчә-to inquire thoroughly' - derivative verb with affix *-чә* of ancient root *тәп* 'bottom', 'foundation';

ташы- 'to bear' - derivative verb with affix *-ы* from noun *таш* 'stone' (associative similarity of weight);

ташла- 'to throw', 'to throw away', 'to leave', 'to direct' - derivative verb with affix *-ла* from *таш* 'stone';

кыста- 'to persuade'– secondary verb from ancient root *якыс*- 'to squeeze', 'to press';

кызык- 'to take interest', 'to envy' derivative verb with affix *-ык* from *кыз*- 'to become inflammable';

өстә- 'to increase', 'to add' derivative verb with affix *-ә* from *өст* 'top'.

As a result of stems acquiring figurative meanings, productive affixes become non-productive or stop functioning.

In some stems we can observe phonologic and semantic changes simultaneously. For example, word *кауша*-to be lost', 'to be embarrassed' is formed from adjective *как* 'dry' with the help of affix *-ша*.

Morphemic construction of a word in the course of **substitution** remains the same in a quantitative sense, only one link in a word-formative chain changes – meaning and character of an affix, i.e. its functions. A root morpheme as such in a word does not change, it just begins to play another role. In Tatar language its process is observed in conversion of some morphogenetic affixes into word-formative ones. As an example we can mention cautionary affixes which can take part in creation of verbs and change their lexical meaning: *булыш*-to help' from verb *бул*- 'to be'; *кичәр*- 'to forgive' from verb *кич*- 'to go by'. Sometimes cautionary affixes help to create derivative verbs which are not directly connected to the meaning of producing stems: *тыгыл*-to get blocked' from verb *тык*- 'to shove', *тартыш*- 'to wrangle', 'to argue' from verb *тарт*- 'to pull', *алыш*- 'to fight' from verb *ал*- 'to take'. In the course of words using these verbs have gained figurative meaning that is not connected with word-formative process. Their metaphorical meaning has been generated as a result of word's semantic evolution. In modern Tatar literary language, in parallel with them, we can observe verbs in cautionary meaning: *баумартышты*-helped to pull a rope', *эшкә тыгылу*- 'to meddle in some affairs', *чөгәндералышу*- 'to help gather in beet'.

4. CONCLUSION

We believe that the popular Turkology idea, that the Turkic word structure is first of all monosyllabic, is well grounded; in modern literary language, in dialects and subdialects of Tatar language it is easy to ascertain further derivativeness of several dozens of disyllabic verb stems, for example: *ар-ары*- 'to get tired', *чәр-чәре*- 'to rot', *кор-коры*- 'to run dry'.

All analyzed non-derivative words, judging by etymologic analysis, were created with the help of independent roots and affixes, because in the composition of indecomposable verbs we can observe etymologic roots and affixal elements. Among affixes we can see both originally word-formative and morphogenetic (for instance, cautionary) ones.

In the course of a long historical evolution of language structure of some words underwent de-etymologization, i.e. the initial morphemic members boundaries were effaced.

Word's archaization is the main reason of de-etymologization, it is observed in most of stems. Some historical roots, which are not used in language now, are popular in Tatar dialects and in modern Turkic languages. Semantic and phonetic changes in words are not as numerous as root's death.

Verbs-parallels, created due to substitution, are rarer in Tatar language.

We can state that such phenomena as de-etymologization (full, semasiological, phonetic) and verbs-parallels refer to different chronologic stages of the language's structural grammatical evolution. According to the article authors' opinion, full de-etymologization is an older phenomenon. Whereas verbs-parallels are more modern.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The authors confirm that the presented data are free of conflict of interests.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The work was prepared within the frames of implementation of "Plan of measures on execution of the Program of competitive recovery of FSAEI HVE `K(V)FU` among leading world scientific educational centres for 2013 – 2020".

REFERENCES

1. Melioranskiy P.M. Arabian philologists about Turkish language. – St. Petersburg: Printing office of imperial Academy of Sciences, 1900. - P. LXII.
2. Ramstedt G.I. Introduction to Altaic linguistics. – Moscow: Publishing house of Oriental literature, 1957. - 254 p.
3. Carl Brockelmann. Osttürkische Grammatik der islamischenLiteratur-SprachenMittelasiens. — Leiden, 1954, VIII, 429 S.
4. Baskakov N.A. Historico-typological morphology of Turkish languages. - Moscow: Science, 1979. - 207 p.
5. Kononov A.N. Grammar of language of Turkic runic memorials of VII-IX centuries. - Leningrad: Science, 1980. - 225 p.
6. Shcherbak A.M. Essays on comparative morphology of Turkic languages: a verb. - Leningrad: Science, 1981. - 183 p.
7. Musayev K.M. Lexicology of Turkic languages. – Moscow: Science, 1984. - 228 p.
8. Kaidarov A.T. Structure of monosyllabic roots and stems in Kazakh language. – Alma-Ata: Science, 1986. - 327 p.
9. Dybo A.V., 2003. An Etymological dictionary of the Altaic languages. Vol. 1-3. Leiden, pp: 2096.
10. Marcel Erdal. A Grammar of Old Turkic. Leiden, 2004. 573 c.
11. Typology of Quantification: On Quantifiers and Quantification in Finnish and Languages Spoken in the Central Volga–Kama Region. // Editors: Pirkko Suihkonen & Valery Solovyev) / Gulshat Galiullina, Alfiya Yusupova, Gul'nara Mansurova. - University of Helsinki. - LINCOM Studies in Language Typology 28: Muenich, 2013. – 400 pp.
12. Garipov T.M. Bashkir nominal word formation. - Ufa, 1959. - 223p.
13. Khisamova F.M. Crucial tasks of research of word composition in Tatar language in the context of development of Tatar morphemes structural functional computer model. – URL: old.kpfu.ru/conf/LENCA-2/321.pdf.
14. Bogoroditskiy V.A. Introduction to Tatar linguistics: with a view to other Turkic languages. – Kazan: Tatizdat, 1953. – 219 p.
15. Shaikhulov A.G. Monosyllabic root stems in Kypchak languages of Urals-Volga region: in 2 parts. Part 1. - Ufa: Eastern University, 2000. - 212 p.
16. Akhmetyanov R.G. Concise historico-etymologic dictionary of Tatar language. - Kazan: Tatar Book House, 2001.- 272 p.
17. Nurieva F. Sh. Literary language of the Golden Horde: norms and variations // Life Science Journal 2014; 11(10). – P. 713-717. <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>
18. Oner M. Some attempts to research the present-day vocabulary of the Kipchak languages // Tatarica, №1, 2013. – P. 36-69.
19. Tumasheva D.G. Dictionary of Siberian Tatars dialects. - Kazan: Kazan University Publishing House, 1992. - 256 p.
20. Explanatory dictionary of Tatar language: in 3 volumes. - Kazan: Tatar Book House, 1977, 1979, 1981.
21. Explanatory dictionary of Tatar language.- Kazan: Tatar Book House, 2005.- 848p.
22. Ancient Turkic dictionary / edited by V.M. Nadeyayev, D.M. Nasilov, E.R. Tenishev, A.M. Shcherbak. – Leningrad: Science, 1969. - 676 p.
23. Yegorov V.G. Etymologic dictionary of Chuvash language. – Cheboksary: Chuvash Book House, 1964. - 355 p.
24. Linguistics. Big encyclopaedic dictionary./ Chief editor V.N. Yartseva. – 2nd edition – Moscow: Big Russian encyclopaedia, 2000. –688p.